

B2B Procedures

- Customer and Site Details (procedure changes)
- Service Order (procedure changes)
- Meter Data (version change)
- One Way Notification (version change)
- Technical Delivery Specification (procedure changes)
- B2B Guide (document changes)

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: AGL

Completion Date: 6 July 2021

Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section)..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- 1. Issues Paper Questions..... 3
- 2. Customer Site Details Notification Process Service Order Process..... 7
- 3. Service Order Process..... 8
- 4. Technical Delivery Specification 9
- 5. B2B Guide 10
- 6. Technical Delivery Specification **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1. Issues Paper Questions

Topic	Question	Comments
2.1.1 Remove Unstructured Site Address	Question 1: Do you support the Changes in respect of Removal of Unstructured Site Address? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	AGL supports this change.
2.1.1 Remove Unstructured Site Address	Question 2: If the Changes in respect of Removal of Unstructured Site Address were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	AGL does not expect issues with a Nov 2022 implementation.
2.1.2 Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number	Question 3: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	AGL supports these changes.
2.1.2 Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number	Question 4: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	AGL does not expect issues with a Nov 2022 implementation.
2.2 Changes to Person Name Given and Person Name Title fields	Question 5: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Person Name fields? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	AGL supports these changes.

Topic	Question	Comments
2.2 Changes to Person Name Given and Person Name Title fields	Question 6: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Person Name fields were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	AGL does not expect issues with a Nov 2022 implementation.
2.3 Treatment of Coincident De-Energisation and Re-Energisation SOs by Non-Regulated Businesses	Question 7: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Coincident Service Order Logic for non-regulated businesses? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	AGL supports these changes.
2.3 Treatment of Coincident De-Energisation and Re-Energisation SOs by Non-Regulated Businesses	Question 8: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Person Name fields were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	AGL does not expect issues with a Nov 2022 implementation.
2.4 Unauthorised Connection Process	Question 9: Do you support the inclusion of the process flow with regards to Unauthorised Connection Process? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	AGL supports these changes.

Topic	Question	Comments
2.4 Unauthorised Connection Process	Question 10: If the process flow proposed in this document with regards to Unauthorised Connection Process is included in the B2B Guide, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	AGL does not expect issues with a Nov 2022 implementation. Noting that this is simply a change to the Guide which reflects current business practice, there should be no issues (except perhaps understanding) by having this change made in Nov 2022.
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 11: Are there better options to accommodate the proposed change that better achieve the stated objectives? What are the related pros and cons? How would they be implemented?	Consideration should be given to making changes to the B2B guide and the updating of B2B procedures with editorial / informational which could be made sooner as there is no system or process impact on industry.
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 12: What are the main challenges in adopting these proposed changes? How should these challenges be addressed?	The challenges relating to customers naming is already inherent in the current schemas and has only been limited by the B2B technical Guide and likely some participants internal validations, so it this change is relatively straightforward. Changes for structured addresses will require all NMIs to have a structured address associated with them, which in tun will require a number of NMIs in MSATS to be updated and then that data to be replicated for the relevant participants prior to B2B going live.

Topic	Question	Comments
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 13: What are the costs and/ or benefits if the proposed changes were not made? Consider the perspectives of process, training, system and customer impacts.	<p>The proposed changes reflect a need to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. better represent customers own identities or2. to improve location identification for MSATS and Service Orders. <p>In the first instance, not being able to properly represent a customer’s identity is a poor outcome for the customer and their interactions with the energy industry.</p> <p>In the second instance, noting that MSATS will require structured addresses, then aligning Service orders to the same standard will minimise errors in identifying service addresses.</p> <p>Poor / inadequate addressing leads to incorrect locational identification which in turn leads to manual work to correctly identify sites, failed services, or other inefficiencies in industry work.</p> <p>While each failure is minor the overall impact of these is sufficiently large to warrant change.</p>
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 14: Do you have any other suggestions, comments or questions regarding this consultation? If you have any comments outside of the scope of this consultation, please reach out to your relevant B2B-WG representatives.	None

2. Customer Site Details Notification Process Service Order Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
V3.6.2		AGL Supports the change
V3.7 – CI 5.5		AGL Supports the change

3. Service Order Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
V3.6.2		AGL supports the changes
V3.7 – Cl 2.17.1		AGL supports the change
V3.7 – CL 2.18		AGL supports the change
V3.7 – Cl 4.1 (table)		AGL supports the change
V3.7 – Cl 4.2		AGL supports the change

4. Technical Delivery Specification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
V3.6.2		AGL supports the change
V3.7 – CL 3.5		AGL supports the change. AGL notes there may be some debate as to whether the correct reference to the Australian Standard is AS 4590-2020 or AS 4590-2017 – Amd1 2020. Regardless of the correct specification for the standard, AGL supports the change to allow single names customers and newer name titles, such as Mx. AGL also notes that the schema does not specify a particular Australian Standard, and therefore always relates to the current standard.

5. B2B Guide

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		AGL Notes that the B2B Guide does not have a consistent release number linked to the remaining B2B Procedures.
V1.7 – CI 2		AGL Supports the change
V1.7 - CI 6.1.4.4		AGL Supports the change but suggests that the diagram gets a separate section number – eg 6.1.4.5
V1.7 – CI 8		AGL Supports the change